The MILITANT

Semi-Monthly Organ of the Opposition Group in the Workers (Communist) Party of America.

"It is necessary that every member of the Party should study calmly and with the greatest objectivity, first the substance of the differences of opinion, and then the development of the struggles within the Party. Neither the one nor the other can be done unless the documents of both sides are published. He who takes somebody's word for it is a hopeless idiot, who can be disposed of with a simple gesture of the hand."—Lenin

VOL. I., No. 1. NEW YORK, N. Y., NOVEMBER 15, 1928 PRICE 5 CENTS

For the Russian Opposition!

Against Opportunism and Bureaucracy in the Workers Communist Party of America!

A STATEMENT TO AMERICAN COMMUNISTS BY JAMES P. CANNON, MARTIN ABERN AND MAX SHACHTMAN.

On October 27 the undersigned members of the Central Executive Committee were declared expelled from the Party for the views expressed in our statement to the Political Committee on the same date, which is printed below. This action, taken by the Political Committee in violation of the Party constitution, without even the formality of a meeting of the Central Executive Committee to which we were elected by the Party convention, was designed to deprive the Party members of the opportunity to hear our views and to insure themselves against any opposition in the forthcoming Party discussion and elections to the Party convention... Our views relate to principle questions upon which it is not possible for revolutionaries to remain silent... We proposed to defend these views in the Party according to the rules for Party discussion laid down in the Party constitution... The abrogation of the Party constitution and the denial of our rights as Party members compels us to take this method of direct appeal to the Party members in order to bring our position before them... We will continue to expound our views in the columns of The Militant until our Party rights are restored.—Editor.

1. In the view of the necessity of concentrating the full attention of the Party on the election campaign, we have refrained up till now from any statement or step calculated to open a Party discussion on disputed questions until the election campaign will have been ended and the pre-convention discussion opened.

2. We have definite views on a series of fundamental questions vitally affecting the whole future of the Party and the Comintern which it was our intention to bring before the Party in the pre-convention discussion period.

3. The "discussion" of these questions conducted up till now has not been a real discussion since many of the documents—in our opinion some of the most important political documents of our time—have been suppressed and concealed from the parties of the Comintern or presented to them in garbled form. The opportunity which has come to us in the recent period to read a number of these documents, dealing with some of the most disputed problems of the Comintern in the past five years, together with the rapid confirmation of their correctness by the whole course of events, have shaped our views and convictions. We consider it our revolutionary duty to defend these views before the Party.

4. We had intended to undertake this task at the opening of the Party discussion after the election campaign. However, the arbitrary actions already taken against us (our removal from all positions on October 16) and the plain indications shown in the present hearing of the intention to take further organizational measures and to begin a public campaign against us in the Party press make it necessary to state our position without further delay. It must be made clear to the Party that the measures are being taken against us solely because of our political views. These views must be presented to the Party as they really are.

5. We present them here in outline form and will elaborate on them more fully in our appeal to the Central Executive Committee against the actions taken by the Polcom.

6. We stand on the main line of the document entitled "The Right Danger in the American Party" (excepting certain erroneous formulations dealing with the world position and role of American imperialism), presented to the Sixth World Congress of the Comintern by the delegation of the Opposition, in the drafting of which we actively participated. As set forth in this document, we believe that the present leadership of the Party, mechanically imposed upon the Party by the E. C. C. I. against the will of the membership, is a consciously developing right wing, whose course and actions are all in the direction of undermining, the position of the Party in the class struggle. Its activities since the presentation of our document on "The Right Danger in the American Party" to the World Congress, have confirmed and not refuted this estimate. The irresponsible adventurism, the factional degeneration and bureaucratic corruption of the Lovestone group leadership are an organic part of its fundamental opportunist character.

7. The latest decision of the secretariat of the E. C. C. I. which undertakes to dismiss a whole series of principle questions raised in our indictment of the Party leadership with a formal motion, giving no answer whatsoever to the burning questions of the Party in all fields of the class struggle, serves only to strengthen the mechanical strangle-hold of the right wing leadership upon our Party. This bureaucratic secretarial method of dealing with disputed principle questions must be emphatically rejected by the Party both in form and content, since they have nothing in common with Lenin's teaching regarding the ideological leadership of all Communist Parties by the Comintern and the unremitting struggle against opportunism on all fronts.

8. The present attempt of some of the leaders of the Foster-Bittelman group who signed the document on the "Right Danger" to abandon that platform, to moderate the struggle against the Lovestone-Pepper right wing, and to effect a political coalescence with them in order to direct their attack against those who remain true to that platform and develop its logical and inevitabile international implications, in no way alters the fundamental correcteness of the document. It merely demonstrates the political instability of these leaders which hampers the process of developing an opposition to the present right wing leadership and line of the Party on a principle basis. We have no doubt that the supporters of the Opposition who have regarded the struggle against the right wing leadership as a principle question will continue to adhere to this position despite the vacillations and maneuvers of a section of the leaders.

9. The problems of the American Party are organically bound up with the fundamental questions confronting the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Comintern, and cannot be solved separately from them. The left wing of the American Party, taking shape in the principle struggle against the right wing leadership of the Party (Lovestone-Pepper group) will go forward only insofar as it recognizes the necessity of a struggle against the right danger on an international scale and links up its fights in the American Party with the Bolshevik fight for the fundamental tenets of Leninism in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and in the Comintern.

10. The Opposition in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union led by L. D. Trotsky has been fighting for the unity of the Comintern and all its sections on the basis of the victory of Leninism. The correctness of the position taken by the Russian Opposition over a period of five years of struggle has been fully confirmed by events.

a) The struggle led by Trotsky since 1923 for Party democracy and against bureaucratism as the

Trotsky and Radek Seriously Ill

The most alarming reports have reached us concerning the condition of health of Leon Trotsky and Karl Radek, leaders of the Russian Opposition who were forcibly exiled to Turkestan and Western Siberia respectively. Both of them are severely stricken with malaria and unless they are given the most careful medical attention grave concern is felt for their lives.

We have just received a message from Moscow, from unquestionably reliable and authentic sources, which tells of the repercussions among the Russian workers. Despite the utmost official vigilance to hush up the story of Trotsky's and Radek's illness, the entire city of Moscow woke up this morning (i.e., the day this letter was written) to find the walls and buildings all over the city placarded with appeals by the Opposition workers to the Moscow proletariat to protest against the scandalous treatment accorded the exiled Bolsheviks in their illness.

The **Volkswille,** organ of the German opposition, reports a letter written by L. Sosnowski to the Moscow **Izvestia,** official organ of the Soviet Government, in which the seriousness of Trotsky's illness is confirmed by information received directly from Alma Ata, Trotsky's place of exile. The banished revolutionst's malarial condition has been rendered more serious by other complications. Sosnowski bitterly protests against the cold-blooded cynicism of the present chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council, Voroschilov, who made himself infamous with his sneering reply at a meeting when a worker asked about the disturbing reports regarding Trotsky's health.

The life of Lenin's co-worker, one of the geniuses of the revolution, lion-hearted Trotsky, is in imminent danger! The condition of Comrade Radek is also serious. Should the official neglect that is being substituted for comradely aid prove fatal to these revolutionary giants, their blood will be upon the heads of those who persecute them and those who do not protest.

Communist workers of America:

Defend the lives of Trotsky and Radek!

Demand their return to Moscow and the provision of the best medical aid in their illness!

An end to the persecution of the fighters for Bolshevism!

M. Spector Expelled In Canada

Maurice Spector, member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International has just been suspended from the Communist Party of Canada for his refusal to endorse the expulsion of Cannon, Abern and Shachtman from the Communist Party of America and for his statement defending his position and supporting our demand for the publication of the suppressed documents of the Russian Opposition. His statement, a scathing arraignment of the bureaucratic regime, will be printed in the next number of The Militant.

The great seriousness for the entire Communist movement of North America of the action taken against comrade Spector will be realized when it is pointed out that he was unanimously elected to the Executive Committee of the Communist International at the Sixth World Congress on the nomination of the Canadian delegation. He has been the Chairman of the Canadian Party for many years and the editor of the Party organs, the Canadian Worker and the Canadian Labor Monthly. The suspension of comrade Spector, the political leader of the Canadian Party since its formation, is fully in line with that course of desperate bureaucrats on an international scale who are unable to defend themselves in open discussion and whose "leadership" depends on an abrogation of the democratic rights of the party members.

We send our warmest greetings to our fellow-fighter in the Canadian Communist Party and express the confidence that his fight against our expulsion will be met with reciprocal support from the proletarian Communists in the ranks of our party. Our cause is international and the Communist militants of all countries must fight together for it.

As we go to press word comes also of expulsion proceedings beginning against other members of the Communist Party of America and the the Y. W. L. who oppose our expulsion. It is being attempted to carry out this campaign of disruption behind a curtain of silence in the official party press. But this game will not succeed. The real facts about the attempt to silence the voice of Communist workers by expulsion, which the party bureaucrats have learned from Sigman and Lewis, will be revealed in the next number of The Militant. The expulsion of the editors of The Militant is dealt with on another page of this issue.

pressure of another class upon the Party of the proletariat, was absolutely correct then and is even more so now. The adoption of this position by Zinoviev, Kamenev and others in 1926, and the attempt of Stalin to adopt it now, demonstrates the tremendous pressure of class forces which impel the Communist Party of the Soviet Union to this platform. The struggle for Party democracy, against bureaucratism and for a regime of genuine Leninist self-criticism are burning questions now for every Party and for the Comintern as a whole.

b) The necessity for a more relentless struggle against the Kulak and the Nepman—for an orientation exclusively upon the workers and hired hands, united with the village poor and lower peasantry and in alliance with the middle peasantry—proclaimed by the Opposition, becomes clearer every day. The trend of events and the irresistible pressure of class forces is already driving a deep cleavage in the leadership of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, and is forcing the Stalin Group to struggle against the right wing (Rykov, etc.) with other elements (Bucharin) vacillating between the two. The platform of the Russian Opposition, prepared for the Fifteenth Congress of the C. P. S. U., indicates the revolutionary policy for the present situation in Soviet Union. The prediction and warning contained in this platform against the inevitable growth and aggressiveness of a genuine right wing in the Party (Rykov, Tomsky, etc.), has been precisely confirmed in the intervening period, particularly in recent months. The activities of this right wing, have already necessitated organizational measures in the Moscow and other organizations of the Party—a proof of the awakening of the proletarian masses of the Party to this danger. The "left" course of the Stalin group in the direction of a struggle against the right dangers, for Party democracy and self-criticism, against the bureaucrats, the Nepmen and the Kulaks, can become a real left course only insofar as it abandons zig-zag movements, adopts the whole platform of the Opposition, and reinstates the tested Bolshevik fighters, who have been expelled, to their rightful places in the Party.

c) The attempts to revise the basic Marxist-Leninist doctrine with the spurious theory of "socialism in one country" have been rightly resisted by the Opposition led by Trotsky. A number of revisionist and opportunist errors in various fields of Comintern activity and its ideological life in general have proceeded from this false theory. To this in part at least can be traced the false line in the Chinese revolution, the debacle of the Anglo-Russian Committee, the alarming and unprecedented growth of bureaucratism in the Comintern, an incorrect attitude and policy in the Soviet Union, etc., etc. This new "theory" is bound up with an overemphasis on the power and duration of the temporary stabilization of capitalism. Herein lies the true source of pessimism regarding the development of the proletarian world revolution. One of the principle duties of every Communist in every Party of the Comintern is to fight along with the Opposition for the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin on this basic question.

d) The Opposition was absolutely correct when it demanded the immediate rupture of the Anglo-Russian Committee and the concentration of all the fire of the Comintern and the British Party upon the leaders of the British Trade Union General Council (Purcell, Hicks and Co.) immediately after the betrayal of the general strike. The maintenance of the Anglo-Russian Committee after that event did not serve as a bridge to the British masses but as a partial shield of the traitorous leaders from the fire of the Communists.

e) Rarely before in history has a Marxist-Leninist appraisal and forecast been so completely and swiftly confirmed as in the case of the Opposition theses and proposals (Trotsky, Zinoviev) on the problems and tasks of the Chinese revolution. The line of the E. C. C. I., formulated by Stalin, Bucharin, Martynov, etc., and the repection of the proposals of the Opposition, which were suppressed and concealed from the Parties of the Comintern, have brought catastrophic results and hampered the genine development of the Communist Party of China and the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the workers and peasants. In view of its world historical importance, a real discussion of the problems of the Chinese revolution, with all the documents being made available, is imperative for all Parties of the Comintern. The prohibition of this discussion must be broken down, the truth must be told and the enormous errors exposed down to their roots. Only in this way can the great lessons of the Chinese revolution be learned by the parties of the Comintern.

11. We demand the publication of all the documents of the Russian Opposition without which the Party members do not and cannot know the essential issues of the struggle and cannot form intelligent opinions in regard to them. The discussion of these issues heretofore has been conducted in an atmosphere of prejudice, misrepresentation, terrorism, outlawing of all thought and inquiry, the substitution of official say-so for the study of documents and facts on disputed questions. All this has been part of a campaign of unparalleled slander against Trotsky who, ofter Lenin, was the outstanding leader of the Russian revolution and the Comintern, and was accompanied by the falsification of the history of the revolution itself.

12. We intend, at the coming Plenum of the Central Executive Committee, to propose that our Party shall take the initiative in demanding the return from exile and the re-instatement into the Communist Party of the Soviet Union with full rights, of Trotsky and the other imprisoned and exiled members of the Russian Opposition. Violence and persecution against counter-revolutionaries is a revolutionary duty; violence and persecution against tried and loyal Bolsheviks is a crime.

13. The consolidation of the Opposition in the American Party, which logically and inevitably merges with the path of the Opposition in the Communist Party of the Soviet Union led by Trotsky, has developed in the struggle against the right danger. The pitiful attempt to characterize this Opposition as a "right" tendency, related to non-Communist elements such as Lore who have been fighting the Party from the right, and anti-Communist elements like Salutsky, who have gone completely over to the side of the labor lieutenants of capitalism, does not in the least correspond with political reality and is designed to cover the progressive drift of the Party leadership to the right. On the contrary, the attempts to exclude us from responsible Party work, and even from the Party itself, along with the proletarian Communists who support us, while at the same time the control of the Party apparatus and the Party leadership in such unions as the needle trades consolidates more firmly in the hands of the opportunists, who fight their Communist-worker critics with expulsion and physical violence—al this can only accelerate the **rapprochement** between the right wing leadership of the Party and right wing and petty-bourgeois elements now out-side the Party.

14. The Lovestone group leadership, by its opportunist political outlook, its petty-bourgeois origin, its corrupt factionalism, its careerism and adventurism in the class struggle, is the greatest menace to the Party. Its mechanical grip on the apparatus of the Party grows steadily tighter and chokes out is inner life. Capable, experienced and trustworthy comrades are one by one removed from responsible posts and replaced by faction agents, incompetents, upstarts, unknown and inexperienced in any serious work in the class struggle. The Party itself, the mass work and the mass organizations under the influence and direction of the Party, are thereby undermined.

16. By its whole character the Lovestone leadership is the "logical" American banner-bearer of the demogogic and unscrupulous international campaign against the leaders of the Russian Opposition. The aspirations of certain former leaders of the Opposition in the American Party to grasp this banner for themselves are pathetically futile. The hopes of the Foster group to escape thereby the factional persecution of the Lovestone group and to secure their organizational positions can succeed only insofar as they surrender their former opposition standpoint. The whole course of the Lovestone group, which has no roots in the labor movement, is toward a monopoly of the Party apparatus and cannot be otherwise.

17. We declare our intention to appeal to the Plenum of the Central Executive Committee to reverse the action of the Polcom against us, which is motivated by neither principle foundation nor Party interest, and is the result purely of factional considerations and bureaucratic fear of discussion and criticism.

18. The arbitrary decisions made against us cannot in the slightest degree change our position as Communists, since the Party we helped to found and build is our Party. Reserving the right to express our viewpoint and opinion on these disputed questions, we will continue to adhere to the discipline and decisions of the Party as heretofore. Under all circumstances we will continue to live with the Party and work for its future.

19. We demand that simultaneously with the announcement of the decision of the Polcom on the outcome of this hearing, our statement shall be given to the Party in the same manner.

JAMES P. CANNON, (Member of the Political Committee and C.E.C.).
MARTIN ABERN, (Member of the C.E.C.)
MAX SHACHTMAN, (Alternate to the C.E.C.).

Trade Union Questions

The past year has witnessed a sharp turn in the tactics of the party and the left wing in the direction of organizing the unorganized and forming new unions. The sharpening of the class struggle and the crisis in the labor movement created the conditions for this turn and the Party was not ahead of the situation, but lagged behind it. This arose from the natural conservatism of the Party leadership and its inability to understand the processes going on in the working class and in the labor movement. It was the hammering of the Opposition and the pressure of the R.I.L.U. which compelled the formal adoption of the new line—and this only after many favorable opportunities had been lost.

How has this new line been carried out? In the recent months the question of the new trade union policy passed over from the field of debate to the field of practice. The forces of the Party and the left wing have gone through some gruelling battles, and in at least three industries—Coal mining, Textile and Needle Trades—definite, experience in the formation of new unions has been gained. The Communists and left wing workers again proved themselves to be the leading dynamic force in the labor movement in these struggles.

What are the results and lessons of this experience, the successes and the errors? One will seek in vain to find answers to these questions in the Party press or, for that matter, to find sufficient authentic information recorded there from which deductions could be made.

It is time now to review the experience and draw some necessary conclusions for the trade union work of the next future. Such indeed is the paramount task of the Party. In order to do this it will be necessary to proceed from an understanding of the situation as it actually exists; to know the sober facts which have been hidden behind the blatant press-agentry; to lay bare the enormous errors (and worse) of the Party leadership which have been covered up by optimistic official reports.

The document on the "Right Danger in the American Party," in the trade union section (written by Foster) which is printed in this issue of The Militant, speaks warningly of the harmful consequences which ensue when irresponsible dilettantes and opportunist faction-mongers gain control and direction of mass work. This warning, fraught with the gravest consequences for the future of the movement, is written in blazing letters in the experience of the past year, and particularly the past six months, of the Party's trade union work. The longer this lesson remains unlearned the greater the prices to be paid for the knowledge.

In forthcoming issues of the Militant—while we are denied our rights to expression in the Party press—we intend to deal at length with the question of the Party trade union policy and work; and to do so not only from a general standpoint, but also from the standpoint of the concrete experience and the actual facts connected with it—and with specific and particular reference to the Miners', Textile and Needle Trades' Unions.

PAMPHLETS COMING

The Editors of The Militant are undertaking the task of publishing all the suppressed documents of the Russian Opposition, a treasure of Leninist literature, in pamphlet form as well as serially in The Militant. Your help is needed in this revolutionary work Follow the example of a group of Communist workers in New York who are pledging a regular amount weekly.

THE MILITANT

Published twice a month by the Opposition Group in the Workers (Communist) Party of America

P.O. Box 120 Madison Square Station—New York, N.Y.
Subscription rate: $1.00 per year. Foreign, $1.50
5c per copy Bundle rates, 3c per copy.

Editor James P. Cannon
Phone: Gramercy 3411

Associate Editors Martin Abern, Max Shachtman

Concerning Our Expulsion:

A Letter to a Comrade by James P. Cannon

Dear Comrade:—

We were very glad to receive your letter and to hear of your reaction against our expulsion and your wish to receive more information and advice as to procedure. Enough of such letters have already been received to make it clear that the attempt to dispose of the principle questions we have raised by the simple mechanical expedient of our expulsion from the Party will meet with resistance from the worker Communists in the ranks.

Your statement that our expulsion took you by surprise and that the comrades there want to know more than they can learn from the official communications is echoed in other letters also, and quite naturally. Another letter which came today from a Communist coal miner says, "At the beginning I was tremendously surprised. The entire matter hit me so hard that I don't know whether I have come back to earth or not." The people who gamble with the proletarian movement regard the expulsion of loyal fighters for the Party as a clever "trick," a quick and easy solution of troublesome questions. The rank and file militants and the serious revolutionaries who have built the movement and stood loyally by it in its hardest days will take another view in exact proportion as they learn the facts and understand the disruptive consequences of this criminal act. Our foremost task is to make these facts known to the Party and we will endeavor to do this at all cost.

The "suddenness" with which the whole issue has burst upon the Party was unavoidable on our part. The Polcom majority declared us expelled from the Party for our views without even waiting for the Plenum of the Central Executive Committee, before the party members had the slightest inkling of the situation and before we had the opportunity to inform them. Their object was to confront the Party members with our expulsion as an accomplished fact and then to terrorize them into an endorsement of it before the slightest information is in their hands. They expelled us, as they have expelled many good Communists before, in order to deprive us of the possibility of speaking to the Party as Party members. Then they tell the Party it has no right to listen to us because we are "not members of the Party." Such shallow trickery can be based only on the most profound contempt for the intelligence of the rank and file of the Party. To allow such methods to succeed would be to give the power of self-perpetuation to any clique which might gain control of the apparatus and to reduce the principle of democratic centralism to a fiction. According to such procedure the fact of expulsion settles the question. But in the absence of any preliminary discussion, the Party can decide the question wisely and responsibly only if it knows why the expulsion took place and what the expelled members have to say. A Party member who does not demand that right, who keeps quiet, or who votes to endorse this act of bureaucratic disruption for fear of expulsion is not acting like an upstanding Communist whose vote means understainding and conviction.

"How does it happen that you became a supporter of the Russian Opposition and insist so categorically on the right to defend it—even up to the point of temporary expulsion from the Party?" This is the question asked by many comrades as well as by you. "The question is five years old, Trotsky is expelled and the questions are settled—why bring it up again?" Well, it is true that the question is old, but it is by no means "settled" and cannot be settled on the present basis. This is the answer. We are late in learning the truth, late with the performance of our international duty, but that is by no means entirely, or even mainly, our fault. It was possible for us to secure adequate information and judge for ourselves only recently.

We do not demand or expect anyone to accept our views on our say-so. All we ask of those who have stood closest to us in the past, and of the broad circles of the Party which are being stirred to a new interest in the question by our stand and our expulsion, is that they study the question honestly and objectively on the basis of the material which we will provide. From honest study of the material will come conviction as was the case with us. We have no doubt, either, that they will defend these convictions as we do, regardless of personal consequences, because the very essence of the matter is the overshadowing importance of

Editors' Note:—The following letter was written to an active party worker in reply to a letter from him in which he raised a number of questions similar to those dealt with in numerous other letters from comrades in various parts of the country who have asked information and advice on the question of our expulsion from the party and the issues connected with it.

the issues involved.

The wisdom of our action in presenting a clear and direct statement of our position was questioned; but it seems quite clear that its correctness has already been established. The Party needed an alarm bell; it needed an awakening from the stupor of factional intrigue over small questions. The Party needs plain speech now above everything. Strategy, of course, is not to be excluded in such a fight, but it must be strictly subordinated to the major task of telling the truth and stimulating the Party members to demand the truth. This is the real duty of leaders now. It is from this standpoint, in our opinion, that you and the other leading comrades must decide your course—from the standpoint of your responsibility as leaders to the Party and to the rank and file comrades who have confidence in you and look to you for guidance.

It is true that the raising of the fundamental questions of Bolshevism which have arisen on an international scale over a period of five years plays havoc with second-rate and tenth-rate questions of controversy and the group which concerns itself exclusively with them. The fate of the "loyal" Opposition to Lovestone and Pepper is indeed a sad one. But the fate of all groups which base themselves on purely local or national issues cannot be otherwise when the larger questions are "brought up." At the Chicago D.E.C. meeting the majority has already demanded "united support" of the C.E.C. in the fight against "Trotskyism." This only confirms what we predicted from the first. The group which wants to fight "Trotskyism" and at the same time wants to fight the Lovestone-Pepper group which has a copyright on that fight and makes its political living that way; the group which does not know from one day to another where the greatest "danger" lies and where to direct its blows, will naturally and very quickly demonstrate its complete bankruptcy. There is no place for it. Its elimination from the scene proceeds inevitably from the whole situation.

We wish to say a few words regarding the attitude of those comrades who seriously and from their own knowledge and conviction count Trotsky's position prior to 1917 against him. Such an attitude is in no way contradictory to ours. We know that Trotsky and Lenin had differences in the pre-revolutionary struggle and we know that Bolshevism took shape and the Comintern was founded on the basis of Lenin's doctrine to which Trotsky came over. Do we not know also that Trotsky from 1917 fought side by side with Lenin and that even when Trotsky differed with him afterward Lenin never allowed a campaign against him, but on the contrary placed the greatest confidence in him and helped to elevate him to the highest positions? To our own knowledge he spoke at the Fourth Congress of the Comintern as the outstanding leader (next to Lenin) and he made the main report. We know that he had less differences with Lenin after 1917 than any one of the other leaders, although they do not tell us that in the official information.

We have not the slightest doubt, from a study of all the material dealing with the period of 1917-1928 that we have been able to secure, that "Trotskyism" as a political tendency in conflict with Leninism was liquidated prior to the October revolution. The disputes of 20 years ago are made the center of the fight against Trotsky in recent years only because his opponents and defamers are not able to stand up against him on the actual merits of the present controversies. What is the great historic significance of the action of Zinoviev and Kamenev in uniting with Trotsky in 1926 but an acknowledgement that the campaign against "Trotskyism" in 1923-4-5 had been a false one? Zinoviev, who above all others "educated" us in this campaign said so in so many words.

The struggle of the past five years has resolved around the living issues of the present period. It is our absolute conviction, based on the most objective study of all material we could secure—and carried on in the face of a previous prejudice—that on all of these basic questions of the period the questions around which the whole life and future of the International Communist movement revolve—Trotsky has been in the main correct and the true defender of Leninism.

Regarding our expulsion and the expulsion of others which is already being prepared a few words should be said. The great significance and unbounded consequences of such criminal acts by the Political Committee cannot be overestimated and no kind of diplomacy or expediency will be able to subordinate such an issue. It will inevitably rise up and confront the Party at every turn. The expulsion, **for their views alone,** of loyal Communists, founders of the Party, with honorable records of 15-20 years of activity—in contradistinction to the shady records of many of those who expelled us—cannot be covered up or minimized by any kind of slander. For we are revolutionaries who will fight for our right to belong to the Party and will not let anything tear us away from it. The Polcom "settled" the question by summarily expelling us, but it will arise again immediately after the election campaign when others will demand our reinstatement and are also expelled.

Expulsion is a dangerous fire to play with in a Party which has all too few forces of the kind that are being expelled, forces loyal to the Party and working for its future, who have contributed not a little in building the Party and establishing its prestige among the workers. As the struggle continues and our material is made available to more and more Party members the issue will grow more acute. The wholesale expulsion of proletarian fighters while the petty-bourgeois careerists and adventurers are attracted and drawn to the center—this is the only possible logic of the expulsion course initiated by the Polcom.

We do not believe it is in principle possible for any comrade who disagrees with such a course and understands its unavoidable consequences to give any kind of support to our expulsion. To say that a protest against our expulsion can be made only if one agrees with the position of the Russian Opposition on all points seems to us to be putting the question upside down. It would be more correct to say that the expulsion can be endorsed only if one is convinced that the position is wrong on all important points and that we have become enemies of the Party, which no Communist adult believes.

We surely intend to advise a certain tactical line to some of the rank and file comrades to avoid expulsion without repudiating their principles, but leaders to whom the whole Party is looking are duty-bound to speak clearly and tell the Party just what they think, even if it is not a complete support of one position or the other. What is wrong about voting against expulsion when one does not know the facts and has not had sufficient opportunity to adopt a definite position one way or the other? What kind of an atmosphere is it in the Party, what form of Party democratic rights exist, when members feel compelled to vote one way or the other on the spot without any real knowledge of their own? A Party uprising against this whole system will be one of the most fruitful results of our fight.

It is to be expected that those who deprived us of all rights to defend our views in the normal Party way will now raise a great hue and cry because we take other means of bringing our position to the Party membership. They pervert the great Leninist principle of discipline based on a correct revolutionary policy into an instrument for shutting the mouth of the loyal Party member and protecting their opportunist policies and disloyal acts from any real criticism and exposure. Such bureaucratic machinations have nothing in common with Leninist organization principles. We would be unworthy of the name of revolutionists if we allowed our views to be suppressed by such sophistical methods.

It is only miserable bureaucrats and philistines who can keep silent about their views on principle questions. Revolutionaries advocate them. The issues of the Russian Opposition, and their indissoluble connection with our own specific problems will be discussed by the Party in spite of all. And it is our task to see to it that this is not a one-sided discussion, or rather distortion, of the questions, but a presentation of them to the Party as they really are. The regeneration of the Party and the reconstitution of its leadership on a proletarian Communist basis will proceed from this.

Yours fraternally,

J. P. CANNON.

THE DRAFT PROGRAM OF THE COMINTERN

A CRITICISM OF FUNDAMENTALS

By L. D. TROTSKY

THE draft program, that is, the most vital document which is to determine the work of the Comintern for many years to come, has been published only a few weeks prior to the convocation of the Congress, which is being held four years after the Fifth Congress. No reference can be made to the fact that the first draft was published prior to the Fifth Congress, precisely for the reason that it was done several years ago. The second draft differs from the first in structure and endeavors to sum up the developments of recent years. To pass this draft at the Sixth Congress, a draft which bears obvious traces of hurried, and even careless work, without a preliminary serious and scientific criticism in the press, or an extensive discussion in all Parties affiliated with the Comintern would be a very careless and precipitate act.

In the few days we had at our disposal between the receipt of the draft and the dispatch of this letter, we could deal only with some of the most vital problems which must be elucidated in the program.

A series of most important ideas of the draft which perhaps are less burning today but may become of extraordinary importance tomorrow, we are compelled, owing to the lack of time, to leave entirely without consideration. Suffice it to say we could not even receive the first draft program and we had to rely on our memory in dealing with it, as in two or three other cases. It stands to reason that all quotations have been taken from the originals after careful examination.

A Program of International Revolution or a Program of Socialism in One Country.

The chief question on the agenda of the Sixth Congress is the adoption of the program. The nature of the program can for a long time determine and make up the physiognomy of the International. The significance of a program is not so much in the way it formulates the chief theoretical ideas, which in the final analysis is merely a question of "codification," namely a question of laying down in a concise form the concrete truths and generalizations which have been definitely and firmly obtained; it is much more a question of summarizing the world economic and political experiences of the recent period, and particularly the revolutionary struggles of the last five years which were so rich in events and mistakes. The fate of the Communist International in the course of the coming years depends in the literal sense of the term on how these events, mistakes and differences are understood and evaluated in the program.

1.—GENERAL STRUCTURE OF THE PROGRAM

In our epoch which is an imperialist epoch, i. e., an epoch of WORLD economics and WORLD politics, under the hegemony of finance capitalism, not a single national Communist Party can build its program wholly or chiefly on the conditions and tendencies of national develpment. This fully holds good also for the Party that holds sway in the U. S. S. R. The death knell for national programs was definitely sounded on August 4, 1914. The revolutionary Party of the proletariat can rely only on an international program corresponding to the nature of the present epoch as an epoch of the apex and destruction of capitalism. An international Communist program is by no means a summary of national programs or of their common features. An international program is based directly on an analysis of the conditions and tendencies of the world economic and world political system as a whole with all its points of contact and antagonism. i. e., with all the antagonistic interdependence of its parts. In the present epoch the national orientation of the proletariat must and can, to a larger extend than in the past, be based only on a world orientation, and not vice versa. Therein lies the basic and fundamental difference between the Communist International and all shades of national socialism.

Based on this, we wrote in January of this year the following:

> "It is necessary to start to draw up a Program of the Comintern (Bucharin's program is a bad program of a national section of the Comintern: it is not a program of a world Communist Party)."—(Pravda, January 25, 1928).

We have constantly insisted on this on the same grounds since 1923-1924 when the problem of the United States of America arose in its full scope as a problem of WORLD and, in the most direct sense of the word, EUROPEAN POLICY.

In boosting the new draft program Pravda said that a Communist program.

> "differs fundamentally from the program of international Social Democracy not only by the substance of its main ideas, but by the characteristic internationalism of its construction."—(Pravda, May 29, 1928).

In this rather indefinite formulation is expressed the idea which we have outlined above and which was formerly stubbornly rejected. One can only welcome the departure from the first draft program presented by Bucharin which, properly speaking, did not rouse any serious exchange of opinion as it did not give enough cause for such. While the first draft gave a vague schematic reflection of the development of one abstract country toward Socialism, the new draft is trying, insistently and without success as we will unfortunately see, to take world economy as a whole as its starting point in determining the fate of its individual parts.

Linking up countries and continents of various stages of development in a system of mutual dependence and antagonism, levelling out the state of their development and at the same time enlarging the differences between them and irreconcilably setting up one country against the other, world economy has become a mighty reality which holds sway over the economy of individual countries and continents. It is this basic fact that makes the very idea of a world Communist Party a reality. Bringing world economy as a whole to the highest possible phase of development on the basis of private property, imperialism, as the draft absolutely correctly states in its introductions:

> "intensifies the contradiction between the growth of the productive forces of world economy and national State barriers."

Without fully understanding the meaning of this, which has for the first time been vividly revealed to humanity in the last imperialist war, not a step can be made in dealing with the big questions of world politics and world revolutionary struggles.

One would only have to welcome the bold replacement of the axis of the program in the new draft were it not for the fact that in the effort to conciliate this, the only correct position, with tendencies of an entirely opposing character, the draft has become an arena containing great contradictions which undermine the fundamental significance of the new statement of principles.

2. THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

To characterize the first, fortunately discarded draft, it will suffice to say that, so far as we remember, it did not even mention the United States of America. The cardinal problems of the imperialist epoch which, by dint of the very nature of the epoch, must be taken not only in their abstract theoretical but also in their material and historical aspect, were dissolved in the first draft into a lifeless outline of a capitalist country "in general." However, the new draft, and this of course is a great step forward, states that "the economic center of the world has shifted to the United States of America"; that "the 'Dollar Republic' has become the exploiter of all countries"; that the United States "has already won world hegemony for itself," and finally that the competition (in the draft it is wrongly stated "conflict") between United States and European capitalism, primarily British capitalism, "is becoming the pivot in the world conflicts." This has already become absolutely obvious, and a program which would not contain a clear and exact definition of these main facts and features of the world situation would not be a program of an international revolutionary Party.

Unfortunately the main facts and tendencies of the international development of the new epoch indicated above are mentioned in the text of the draft, grafted on to it, so to say, in the way of theoretical back-writing without having any intercontact with the rest of the structure and without leading to any perspective of strategical deductions.

The NEW role of America in Europe since the capitulation of the Communist Party of Germany and the defeat of the German proletariat in 1923, has been entirely left out of consideration. It has not been made clear that the period of "stabilization," "normalization," and "pacification" of Europe including the "regeneration" of Social Democracy, has developed in close material and ideological connection with the first steps of American intervention in European affairs.

Furthermore, it has not been made clear that the inevitable further development of American expansion, the contraction of the markets of European capitalism, including the European market itself, entails the greatest military, economic and revolutionary disturbances such as will leave all disturbances of the past in the shade.

It has not been made clear that the inevitable further onslaught of the United States will place capitalist Europe on a constantly more limited ration in world economy which, of course, does not involve a mitigation, but on the contrary, a monstrous sharpening of the inter-State relations in Europe with furious paroxysms of military conflicts, because States as well as classes, are even more frantically fighting for a hunger ration, nay, a diminishing ration, than for a lavish and growing ration.

In the draft it has not been made clear that the internal chaos of the State antagonisms of Europe render hopeless a more or less serious and successful resistance to the constantly more centralized North American Republic and that the overcoming of the European chaos in the form of the Soviet United States of Europe is one of the first tasks of the proletarian revolution, which in not the least degree as a result precisely of State barriers, is much closer in Europe than in America and which will therefore most likely have to be defended from the North American bourgeoisie.

On the other hand it has been left entirely unmentioned—and this is not the least important phase of the same world problem—that it is precisely the international strength of the United Staths and its unbridled expansion resulting from it, that compels it to include powder magazines throughout the world among the foundations of its structure—the antagonisms between the east and west, the class struggle in Old Europe, uprisings of the colonial masses, wars and revolution. This on the one hand transforms United States capitalism into the basic counter-revolutionary force in the present epoch, becoming constantly more interested in the maintenance of order in every corner of the globe, and on the other hand prepares the ground for a gigantic revolutionary explosion of this already dominant and still increasing world imperialist power. The logic of world relations leads to the idea that the time of this explosion cannot be very far apart from that of the proletarian revolution in Europe.

Our elucidation of the dialectics of the interrelations between America and Europe resulted, during the last few years, in the most diversified accusations against us—accusations about our paacifist denial of the existence of European contradictions, our acceptance of Kautsky's theory of ultra-imperialism and of many other sins. There is no need to deal here with these "accusation," which at best result from a complete ignorance of the real processes and of our relations to them. But we cannot refrain from mentioning, however, that it would be difficult to waste more effort in confusing and muddling up the most vital world problem than was wasted, by the way also by the authors of the draft program, in the petty struggle against our formulation of the problem which has been entirely confirmed by the course of events.

Efforts have been made—on paper—in the leading Communist press, also of recent date, to minimize the significance of American hegemony by referring to the imminent economic and industrial crisis in the United States. We cannot enter into a consideration of the problem of the time of the American crisis and as to its possible depth. This is not a question of program but of conjuncture. For us, of course, the inevitability of a crisis is absolutely unquestionable and, considering the present world expansion of American capitalism, its great depth and sharpness is not excluded. But the efforts to minimize or weaken the importance of North American hegemony on this ground is not justified by anything, and can only lead to most profound errors of a strategical character. On the contrary, IN A CRITICAL EPOCH THE HEGEMONY OF THE UNITED STATES WILL PROVE EVEN MORE COMPLETE, MORE OPEN, MORE RUTHLESS, THAN IN THE PERIOD OF BOOM. The United States will try to overcome and get out of its difficulties and helplessness primarily at the expense of Europe—regardless whether this will happen in Asia, Canada, South America, Australia or Europe itself.

It must be clearly understood that if the first period of American intervention had a stabilizing and pacifist effect on Europe, which to a considerable extent is still alive today and may occassionally recur and even become stronger (particularly in time of new defeats of the proletariat), the general line of American policy, particularly in time of economic difficulties and crises, brings the greatest disturbances for Europe as well as for the whole world.

From here we draw the not unimportant conclusion that there will be no lack of revolutionary situations within the next ten years any more than in the past. That is why it is so important to understand the mainsprings of development so that we may not be caught by their action unawares. If in the past decade, the main cause of revolutionary situations lay in direct consequence of the imperialist war, in the second post-war decade the main causes of revolutionary situations will be in the relations between Europe and America. A big crisis in the United States will give rise to new wars and revolutions. We repeat: There will be no lack of revolutionary situations. It is all a question of an international proletarian Party, the ripeness and fighting ability of the Comintern, the correctness of its strategical positions and tactical methods.

This trend of thought has found absolutely no expression in the draft program of the Comintern. The mentioning of a fact of such great importance as the fact that "the economic center of the world has shifted to the United States of America," appears as a mere superficial newspaper remark and no more. It is of course absolutely impossible to say in justification of this that there was lack of space, for what are the questions that must find place in a program if not the principal questions? Besides, it should be added that too much space is given in the program to questions of secondary and third-rate importance—let alone the general literary looseness and the numerous repetitions, by a reduction of which the program might be condensed at least one-third.

2a.—SLOGAN OF A SOVIET UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

The elimination of the slogan of a Soviet United States of Europe from the new draft program, a slogan which has already been accepted by the Comintern after a drawn-out internal struggle in 1923, can by no means be justified. Or is it perhaps precisely on this question that the authors want to "return" to Lenin's position of 1915?

In regarding to the slogan of the United States of Europe, Lenin, as is known, vacillated at the beginning of the war. The slogan was at first included in the theses of the Social Democrat (the central organ of the Party at the time) and then rejected by Lenin.

This in itself shows that its suitability was not a question of a general principle; it was merely a question of tactics, a question of comparing its plus and minus signs from the viewpoint of the given situation. Needless to say that Lenin denied the possibility of a realization of a CAPITALIST United States of Europe. That is also how I regarded the question when I advanced the United States slogan, exclusively as a perspective State form of the proletarian dictatorship in Europe.

> "A more or less complete economic amalgamation of Europe ACCOMPLISHED FROM THE TOP by means of an agreement of the capitalist governments is a Utopia"—I wrote. "Here it cannot go further than partial compromises and half measures. By this alone an economic, amalgamation of Europe such as would promise colossal advantages both to the producer and consumer and to the development of culture in general, is becoming a REVOLUTIONARY TASK OF THE EUROPEAN PROLETARIAT in its struggle against imperialist protectionism and its instrument—militarism". — (Trotsky, The Programme of Peace: collected works, Vol. 3, part I, page 85. Russian edition).

Further:

> "A United States of Europe represents first of all a form—the only conceivable form—of proletarian dictatorship in Europe."—(Ibid., page 92).

But even in this formulation of the question Lenin saw AT THAT TIME a certain danger. With the absence of experience of a proletarian dictatorship in one country, the absence of a theoretical clarity on this question even in the left wing of the social democracy of that period, the slogan of a United States of Europe might have given rise to the idea that the proletarian revolution must begin simultaneously at least on the whole European continent. It is against this danger that Lenin issued a warning on this question there was not a shade of difference between Lenin and myself. I wrote at the time:

> "that not a single country must 'wait' for the other countries in its struggle. This elementary idea it will be useful and necessary to repeat so that the policy of international inaction may not be substituted for the conception of parallel international action. Without waiting for the others, we begin and continue the struggle on national grounds with the full conviction that our initiative will give an impulse to the struggle in other countries."—(Ibid., page 89-90).

Then follow my words which Stalin presented at the Seventh Plenum of the E. C. C. I. as the most vicious expression of "Trotskyism," i. e., as a "disbelief" in the inner forces of the revolution and the hope for aid from without.

> "And if this" (development of the revolution in other countries—L.T.) "will not occur, it is hopeless to think (this is borne out by history and by theoretical thought) that for instance revolutionary Russia would be able to hold out in face of conservative Europe, or that Socialist Germany would be able to remain isolated in a capitalist world."—(Ibid., page 89-90).

On the ground of this and two of three similar quotations is based the condemnation of "Trotskyism" by the Seventh Plenum as having held in this "fundamental question" a position "which has nothing in common with Leninism." We will therefore stop for a moment and listen to Lenin himself.

On March 7, 1918 he said on the question of the Brest-Litovsk Peace the following:

> "This is a lesson because the absolute truth is that without a revolution in Germany we will perish."—(Vol. 15, page 132, Russian Edition).

A week later he said:

> "World imperialism side by side with a victorious onslaught of the social revolution cannot get along together."—(Ibid., page 175).

A few days later on April 23, Lenin said:

> "Our BACKWARDNESS has thrust us forward and WE WILL PERISH if we will not be able to hold out until we meet with the mighty support of the INSURRECTIONARY workers of other countries."—(Ibid., page 187. Our emphasis).

But perhaps this was all said under the special influence of the Brest Litovsk crisis? No! In March 1919 Lenin again repeated:

> "We do not live merely in a State but in a system of states and the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with imperialist states FOR ANY LENGTH OF TIME IS INCONCEIVABLE. In the end one or the other must triumph."—(Vol. 16, page 102).

A year later, April 7, 1920, Lenin reiterates:

> "Capitalism, if taken on an international scale, is even now, NOT ONLY IN A MILITARY BUT ALSO IN AN ECONOMIC SENSE, stronger than the Soviet government. WE MUST BASE OUR POLICY ON THIS FUNDAMENTAL IDEA WHICH WE MUST NEVER FORGET."—(Vol. 17, page 102).

In the same year of 1920 we find again:

> "World imperialism cannot live together with the triumphant social revolution."—(Ibid., page 197).

On November 27, 1920, Lenin, in dealing with the question of concessions, said:

> "We have now gone over from the arena of war to peace and we have not forgotten that war will come again. As long as we still have capitalism and socialism we cannot live peacefully—either one or the other will be the victor in the end. The obituary will have to be sung either over the death of world capitalism or the death of the Soviet Republic. Now we have only a respite in the war."—(Ibid., page 398).

But perhaps the further existence of the Soviet Republic made Lenin "realize his mistake" and discard his disbelief "in the inner force" of the October revolution?

At the Third Congress of the Comintern, to wit, in July 1921, Lenin declared:

> "We have obtained an extremely unstable, an extremely unsound, but nevertheless an equilibrium such in which the socialist republic can exist—OF COURSE NOT FOR A LONG TIME—in capitalist surroundings."—(Theses on the Tactics of the C.P.S.U.).

Moreover, on July 5, 1921 Lenin squarely declared at the Congress:

> "It was clear to us that without aid from the international worldwide revolution a victory of the proletarian revolution is impossible. Even before the revolution, and also after it, we thought that the revolution either IMMEDIATELY OR AT LEAST very soon will come also in other countries, in the more highly developed capitalist countries, OTHERWISE WE WILL PERISH. Nothwithstanding this conviction, we did our utmost to preserve the Soviet system under any circumstances and at all costs because we know that we are not working only for ourselves but also for the international revolution."—(Vol. 18, part 1, page 321—Our emphasis).

How infinitely far are these words, so excellent for their simplicity and so permeated through and through with the spirit of internationalism from the present self-sufficient epigone machinations.

At any rate, we have the right to ask wherein do all these utterances made by Lenin differ from the ideas I expressed in 1915 that the coming revolution in Russia or the coming socialist Germany will not be able to hold out alone if "isolated in the capitalist world"? The time of realization is different from that outlined not only in my but also in Lenin's predictions. But the main idea remains in full force even now and perhaps at the given moment more so than ever before. Instead of condemning this idea as the Seventh Plenum of the E. C. C. I. has done on the basis of an incompetent and unscrupulous speech, it must be included in the program of the Communist International.

In defense of the slogan of a Soviet United States of Europe we said in 1915 that the law of uneven development is in itself not an argument against it because the UNEVENNESS of historical development in relation to the difference countries and continents IS IN ITSELF UNEVEN. European countries develop unevenly in relation to each other. Nevertheless it can be maintained with absolute historical certainty that it will not be the fate of a single one of them, at least in the historical epoch under review, to run so far ahead in relation to the other countries as America has advanced in relation to Europe. For America there is one SCALE OF UNEVENESS, for Europe there is another. Geographically and historically conditions have predetermined such a close organic contact between the countries of Europe that by no means can they tear themselves out of it. The modern bourgeois governments of Europe are like murderers chained to one cart. The revolution in Europe, as has already been said, will, IN THE FINAL ANALYSIS, be of decisive importance also for America. But DIRECTLY, in the immediate historical course, a revolution in Germany will be of an immeasurably greater significance for France than for the United States of America. From this historically developed relationship follows also the political vitality of the slogan of a European Soviet Federation. We speak of its RELATIVE vitality because it stands to reason that this Federation will extend, through the great bridge of the Soviet Union, to Asia and will then effect an amalgamation of the World Socialist Republics. But this will be a second epoch or a further great chapter of the imperialist epoch, and when we enter it more closely we will also find the corresponding formulae necessary for it.

That the differences with Lenin in 1915 on the question of the United States of Europe was a narrow tactical, and by its very essence, temporary character, can be proven without any difficulty by further quotations, but it is best proven by the further trend of events. In 1923 the Comintern officially adopted the slogan. If it is true that the slogan of the United States of Europe could not be accepted in 1915 on grounds of principle, as the authors of the draft program now maintain, then the Comintern had no right to adopt it eight years later. The law of uneven development, one should think, has not lost its force of action during these years.

The formulation of the question as outlined above follows from the dynamics of the revolutionary process taken as a whole. The international revolution is regarded as an inter-connected process which cannot be predicted in all its concreteness, but the general historical outlines of it are absolutely clear. Without understanding them a correct political orientation is entirely out of the question.

Matters, however, appear quite differently if we proceed from the idea of socialist development

FOREWORD

With issue The Militant beg the publication "The Draft Program of the Communist International: A Criticism of Fundamentals" by L. D. Trotsky. This document, a masterpiece of Marxist-Leninist literature was submitted by comrade Trotsky to the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International which finally adopted the draft program drafted by comrades Bucharin and Stalin without any important changes. The entire validity of this timely and fundamental criticism remains in spite of the fact that it was kept from the Congress and never discussed by the delegates. The sole attention accorded it was its distribution to members of the Program Commission and a report on the document to the 'Senioren-Konvent" of the Congress which immediatly "settled" the issue without discussion.

A rigid control on this document was established forthwith and the few copies of the document which were distributed were recalled by the Secretariat. Our publication is an authentic copy which we have just received. Deals chiefly with the role of American Imperialism and the prospect of new revolutionary situations, the revisionist theory of "Socialism in one country," with the Chinese revolution and its lessons, and with the formation of workers and peasants parties which Trotsky, in line with Lenin, condemns in principle. Trotsky's comment on the "Third Party Alliance" with La Follette, the fight against which was led by him, will be especially interesting to American communists. The entire document will be printed in full consecutively in this and the forthcoming issues of The Militant without any changes. Its basic importance for the international revolutionary movement and the unanswerable correctness of its position on the burning problems of the Communist International make is an invaluable contribution to the Bolshevik literature of our period.

—Editor.

This Page Intentionally Blank

which transpires and is even being completed in one country. We have now a "theory" which teaches that it is possible to build up Socialism in one country and that the inter-relations of that country with the capitalist world can be built on the basis of "neutralization" of the world bourgeoisie (Stalin). Advancing this essentially national-reformist and not revolutionary international point of view, the necessity for the slogan of a United States of Europe falls away or is at least diminished. But this slogan is, from our viewpoint, important and vitally necessary precisely because it condemns the idea of an isolated socialist development. For the proletariat of every European country, even to a greater extent than for the U.S.S.R.—the difference is only of degree—it will be of the most vital necessity to carry the revolution to the neigbouring countries and to support insurrections in them with arms in hand not because of abstract international solidarity, which is in itself unable to move the classes, but because of the vital considerations which Lenin has formulated hundreds of times—namely, without TIMELY aid from the international revolution we will not be able to hold out. The slogan of the Soviet United States corresponds with the dynamics of the proletarian revolution which does not break out simultaneously in all countries, but passes on from country to country and requires closest class contact among them, especially on European territory, both with the object of defense against the most powerful foreign foes, and with economic objects.

One may, it is true, try to object, declaring that since the period of the Ruhr crisis which was the very last impulse for the adoption of that slogan, the latter has not played a big role in the agitation of the Communist Parties of Europe and has, so to speak, not taken root. But this is fully true also of the slogans of a Workers Soviet Government, etc., i. e., of all slogans to be used ON THE VERY EVE OF REVOLUTION. This may be explained by the fact that since the end of 1923, notwithstanding the mistaken political expectations of the Fifth Congress, the revolutionary movement on the European continent has been on the decline. But that is exactly why it is detrimental to build a program, or some of its parts, under the impressions received only in that period. It was not by mere accident that, despite all prejudices, the slogan of a Soviet United States of Europe was accepted precisely in 1923 when a revolutionary outburst was expected in Germany and when the question of State inter-relationships in Europe assumed an exceedingly burning character. Every new accentuation of the European, and, particularly, the world crisis, is graye enough to be able to raise the main political problems, and to advance again the slogan of the United States of Europe. It is therefore fundamentally wrong to keep silent over the slogan without having rejected it, that is, to keep it somewhere in reserve, to be used "in emergency." On questions of principle the keeping in reserve policy does not hold good.

3. THE CRITERION OF INTERNATIONALISM

The draft, as we already know, is making an effort to proceed in its construction from the viewpoint of world economy and its inner tendencies—a thing which deserves recognition. The **Pravda** is absolutely right when it says that therein lies the basic and fundamental difference between us and national-patriotic Social Democracy. Only by taking world ecenomy, which dominates over all its parts, as a basis can a program of the international proletarian Party be built. But precisely in analysing the main tendencies of world development the draft displays not only an incompleteness, which depreciates its value, as has already been pointed out above, but also falls into gross one-sidedness leading to grave blunders.

The draft refers many times, and not always in the proper place, to the law of uneven development of capitalism as to the main and almost all-determining law of that development. Many mistakes in the draft including the fundamental error, are theoretically based on the one-sided and mistaken non-Marxian and non-Leninist interpretation of the law of uneven development.

In the first chapter the draft says:

> "Uneven economic and political development is an absolute law of capitalism. This unevenness becomes still more accentuated and intensified in the epoch of imperialism."

This is true. This formula in part condemns Stalin's formulation of the question, according to which Marx and Engels did not know the law of uneven development and that it was first discovered by Lenin. On September 15, 1925, Stalin wrote that Trotsky has no reason to refer to Engels who wrote at a time "when THERE COULD BE NO QUESTION of the knowledge of the law of uneven development of capitalist countries." Unbelievable as these words may be, Stalin, one of the authors of the draft, has nevertheless repeated them more than once. The text of the draft, as we have seen, has taken a step forward in this respect. If however, we leave aside the correction of this elementary mistake, what is said in the draft about the law of uneven development is in essence one-sided and insufficient.

It would have been more correct first of all to say that the whole history of mankind is governed by the law of uneven development. Capitalism finds various sections of mankind at diverse stages of development with grave internal contradictions in each one of them. Great diversity in the various levels, and extraordinary uneveness in the rate of development of the different parts of mankind in the various periods of time, is the STARTING POINT of capitalism. The latter gains mastery gradually over the inherited unevenness. It breaks and alters it, employing thereby its own methods and its own ways. In contradistinction to the economic system which preceded it, capitalism is constantly aiming at economic expansion, at the penetration of new territories; the mitigation of economic differences, the conversion of hemmed-in provincial and national economies into a system of financial inter-relationships and thereby brings about their **approchement** and equalizes the economic and cultural levels of the most progressive and backward countries. Without this main process, the relative levelling out of, at first, Europe with Great Britain and then America with Europe, the industrialization of the colonies, the diminishing distance between India and Great Britain, with all the consequences arising from the enumerated processes upon which is based not only the program of the Communist International, but also its very existence, would be inconceivable. By bringing the countries economically nearer to each other and levelling out their state of development, capitalism acts however, by methods of its OWN, that is by anarchistic methods which constantly undermine its own work by playing up one country against another and one branch of industry against another, developing some parts of world economy, while hampering and throwing back the development of some of its other parts. Only the merging of these two main tendencies—the centrifugal and centripetal, the levelling and equalizing tendencies which equally arise from the nature of capitalism—explains to us the live texture of the historical process of the last centuries.

Imperialism, thanks to the universality, penetrability and mobility, and the break-neck rapidity in the formation of finance capital as the driving force of imperialism, lends vigor to both of these tendencies. Imperialism links up imcomparably more rapidly and more deeply the individual national and continental units into one, bringing them into closest and most vital dependence upon each other and rendering their economic methods, social forms and levels of development more identical. It attains this "aim" at the same time by means of such antagonist methods, such jumps, and such flights on the backward countries and districts, that the unification and levelling of world economy effected by it is upset by themselves even more rapidly and in a more convulsive manner than in preceding epochs. Only such a dialetical and not purely mechanical understanding of the law of uneven development can make possible the avoidance of the fundamental error which the draft program, submitted to the Sixth Congress, has failed to avoid.

Right after the one-sided characteristic of the law of uneven development pointed out by us, the draft program says:

> "From this it follows that the international proletarian revolution must not be regarded as a single simultaneous and universal act. The victory of socialism is at first possible in a few or even in one capitalist country."

That the international revolutions of the proletariat cannot be a simultaneous act, of this, it goes without saying, there can in general be no dispute among grown up people after the experience of the October Revolution effected by the proletariat of a backward country under pressure of historical necessity, without having in the least waited for the proletariat of the advanced countries "to even out the front." To that extent the reference to the law of uneven development is absolutely correct and quite in place. But matters stand quite differently with the second half of the deduction—namely, the meaningless statement that the victory of Socialism is possible "in one capitalist country." To prove its point the draft program simply says—"From this it follows." One gets the impression that it follows from the law of uneven development. But it does not follow at all. "From this follows" something quite the contrary. If the historical process would be such that some countries develop not only unevenly, but even INDEPENDENTLY OF EACH OTHER, isolated from each other, then from the law of uneven development would no doubt follow the possibility of the building up of Socialism in one capitalist country—at first in the most advanced country and then, as they mature, in the more backward ones. That was the customary, so to say, average idea of the transition to Socialism within the ranks of pre-war social domocracy. This idea was precisely the theoretical basis of social patriotism. Of course the draft program does not hold this view. But it is inclined towards it.

The theoretical error of the draft lies in the fact that it seeks to deduct from the law of uneven development something which the law does not imply and cannot imply. Uneven or sporadic development of various countries constantly upsets but by no means ELIMINATES the growing economic ties and inter-dependence of these countries which the very next day after four years of hellish war were compelled to exchange their coal, bread and oil for powder and suspenders. On this basic question, the draft expresses the idea that historical development proceeds only on the basis of sporadic jumps while the economic basis which gives rise to these jumps, and upon which they occur, is entirely left out of sight by the authors of the draft, or is forcefully eliminated by them. This is done with the sole object of defending the undefendable theory of Socialism in one country.

After what has been said, it is not difficult to understand that the only correct way to formulate the question would be that Marx and Engels had even prior to the imperialist epoch arrived at the conclusion that on the one hand uneveness, i. e., sporadic historical development, stretches the proletarian revolution through a whole epoch in the course of which the nations will enter the revolutionary flood one after another, while, on the other hand, the organic inter-dependence of the various countries, the developing international division of labor, excludes the possibility of building up Socialism in one country, the more so now in the present epoch when imperialism has developed, deepened and sharpened both these antagonistic tendencies and has rendered the Marxian doctrine that the Socialist revolution can begin only on a national basis while the building up of a Socialist society withing national boundaries is impossible, DOUBLY AND TREBLY TRUE. On this question, Lenin merely developed and put in concrete terms Marxist formulations and Marx's answer to this question.

Our Party program is entirely based on the underlying international conditions of the October revolution and Socialist construction. To prove this, one would only have to copy the theoretical part of our program. Here we will merely point out that when at the Eighth Congress of the Party, the late Podbelsky alluded that some formulations of the program refer only to the revolution in Russia, Lenin replied in his concluding speech on the question of the Party program (March 19, 1919) the following:

> "Podbelsky raised objections to the paragraph which speaks of the PENDING social revolution. His argument is obviously unfounded because IN OUR PROGRAM IT IS A QUESTION OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION ON AN INTERNATIONAL SCALE."—(Vol. 16, page 113).

It will not be out of place to point out here that at about the same time Lenin suggested that our Party change its name from Communist Party of Russia to Communist Party so as to emphasize still further that is a party of INTERNATIONAL REVOLUTION. I was the only one voting for that motion at the C. C. However, he did not bring the matter before the Congress in view of the foundation of the Third International. This position proves that there could not even have been a thought of Socialism in one country at that time. That alone is the reason why the Party program does not condemn this "theory" but merely EXCLUDES it.

But the Young Communist League program which was adopted two years later had to issue a direct warning against home-bred illusions and narrow-mindedness on the question of proletarian revolution, with the object of training the youth in the spirit of internationalism. But we will still speak of this later. (TO BE CONTINUED)

The Right Danger in the American Party

THE main danger in the American Party comes from the right. This is due to the changing objective conditions of the class struggle in the United States and the opportunist political line of the Lovestone group which is the majority of the Central Committee.

The maturing inner contradictions of American capitalism and the leftward drift of the masses produce a turning point in the class struggle. From a long period of retreat before the onslaught of capital the American workers are passing over into a period of defense and resistance preliminary to a higher phase of offensive and aggressive struggle against capitalist exploitation.

In this period of increasing sharpness of class relations and class struggles in the United States, requiring a reorientation of the Party's perspectives to changing conditions and a reformulation of Party policy toward more aggressiveness, initiative and militancy, we confront the danger of holding on to old perspectives, outworn policies and methods of work, which prevent the full unfolding of the Party's leadership in the developing struggles.

The danger in such a period as we are entering in the United States comes from the right. This danger becomes real and actual because the Lovestone group, which constitutes the majority in the Central Committee, refuses to orientate itself to the changing conditions of struggle and pursues an opportunist line, as will be proven in the following points.

1.—Overestimation of the Reserve Powers of American Imperialism.

Two basic factors determine the condition of American capitalism in the present period: 1) The maturing inner contradictions of American capitalism (disproportion between the rate of expansion of productive capacity and rate of growth of volume of production, disproportion between the growth of production and consumption, unemployment, the contradictions of rationalization, capital export, polarization of wealth and poverty, etc.) are beginning to produce **qualitative changes** in the whole economic system; 2) These inner contradictions are maturing in the surroundings of a declining world capitalism and the Socialist growth of the U.S.S.R. which sharpen, intensify and accelerate the development of the contradictions of American capitalism, hastening the coming of its downfall.

An analysis of the degree of ripeness of those contradictions, will show that American capitalism is about to reach **the apex of growth** and that further expansion leads American capitalism to further and more drastic attacks upon the standards of life of the American masses and to an attempt at an armed redivision of the world market and spheres of imperialist domination, both of which only further intensify these contradictions leading to the downfall of American imperialism.

In the light of the above, the present economic depression must inevitably become the forerunner of a deep-going crisis, even though American capitalism may succeed in postponing its coming with the help of the reserve powers which it still enjoys. This depression cannot be viewed merely as a "normal" cyclical depression having only slight and passing effects. On the contrary, because of the qualitative changes which are taking place in American capitalist economy every such cyclical depression intensifies to the highest degree the contradictions of capitalism, undermines deeper the entire structure, eventually leading to deep-going crises.

The Lovestone group has an entirely diffent conception of the position and present phase of American capitalism. This conception is marked by the following characteristics:

1. The main emphasis upon the tendencies making for the growth and power of American capitalism.
2. Totally inadequate emphasis upon the force and cumulative effect of the contradictions of American capitalism, which are already producing qualitative changes.
3. The Lovestone group sees no qualitative changes taking place in American capitalism.
4. Lack of proper evaluation of the inner contradictions of American capitalism as **distinct from** the undermining effects of the declining world capitalism and the growth of the U.S.S.R.
5. Viewing the coming of deep-going crises in America mainly as a result of the disintegrating influences of declining world capitalism, relegating to the background the effects of the inner contradictions of American capitalism.
6. Following the lead of bourgeois economists in evaluating the present depression only as a "recession." On this the Lovestone group persisted as late as February, 1928.
7. Accepting the "theory of spottiness" of the capitalist press and capitalist economists to explain the nature of the present depression and refusal to see its special characteristic as a forerunner of a deep-going crisis.
8. Underestimation of the great significance in the imperialist epoch of the strikingly uneven development of industry (coal, oil, textiles, etc.) in connection with other inner contradictions of American capitalism.
9. Failure to understand the processes of rationalization, the menacing nature of the movement designated as capitalist-engineering-efficiency-socialism and the integration of the labor aristocracy and bureaucracy into the imperialist machine of American capitalism.
10. Failure to understand the full effects of the rationalization drive upon the workers particularly as represented by the large extent of wage cuts, especially piece rates.
11. Assuming that the course of American imperialism will proceed mainly along the lines of development of British capitalism and failure to understand the basically different present world situation.

The totality of these characteristics make for a dangerously opportunist conception of present-day American capitalism and for a grave overestimation of its reserve powers.

This tendency of the Lovestone group finds its expression in the original draft of the February thesis, the C.E.C. plenum resolution of May 1927, and in the writing and speeches of Comrades Lovestone, Pepper, Wolfe, Nearing, etc., etc.

II.—Underestimation of the Leftward Drift of the Masses.

The murderous effects of the rationalization drive of American capitalism upon the masses (4,000,000 unemployed, speed-up, wage-cuts, etc.), the sharpening imperialist aggression of the American ruling class (Nicaragua, China, Philippines, etc.), the success of Socialist construction in the U.S.S.R., the systematic breakdown of the effects of capitalist and reformist propaganda, are all producing a widespread leftward drift of the masses in the United States.

There is a general growth of discontent, militancy and readiness to struggle among the semi-skilled and unskilled workers (the bulk of the American proletariat). A process of widespread and general radicalization is taking place in all industries among the most exploited sections of the workers.

This leftward or radicalization drift of the masses came to most active expression in the struggle of the mining, textile, and needle trades workers, and in the widespread foment and prospects for struggle in the automobile, shoe, oil, meat packing, rubber, and other industries.

The April letter of the E.C.C.I. to our Party characterizes this general leftward drift as "a rapidly growing participation of the workers in mass struggles."

Similar signs of foment and leftward development are shown among the working farmers who continue to suffer under the effects of the agricultural crisis which though somewhat retarded, has not been liquidated.

This leftward drift means a **definite break in the mood of the American masses.** A break from passivity and retreat to increasing militancy and struggle.

The Lovestone group does not share this point of view. Its conception of the mood of the American masses is marked by the following characteristics:

1. Failure to see the break in the mood of the American masses and the coming of a turning point in the class struggle.
2. Denial of the existence of a widespread and general leftward or radicalization drift among the bulk of the American workers, covering it up with a demagogic and false charge against the minority that it believes in a deep-going "revolutionary" radicalization of the "entire" American working class.
3. Carrying over into the question of the mood of the masses the bourgeois "theory of spottiness," insisting upon the "spotty" nature of radicalization in the sense that it is found **only** among the workers in the mining, textile and needle industries.
4. Failure to recognize a leftward drift among the working farmers. Failure to develop an effective agrarian program. Failure to treat the agricultural workers as part of the proletariat!
5. Instead of taking advantage of the obvious manifestations of the radicalization drift of the masses, the Lovestone group underestimates it, and continually and systematically (in speeches, articles, resolutions, etc.) issues warnings and concentrates its attack against those who are seeking to attract the Party's attention and orientate its policy on the growing favorable condition for struggle resulting from this radicalization.

The sum of these characteristics constitute a serious underestimation of the leftward drift of the American masses.

III.—Lack of Perspective of Struggle.

The growing aggressiveness of American capitalism, internally against the masses, externally against its imperialist rivals, chiefly England, and the leftward drift of the masses, constitute the main basis for a perspective of sharpening class struggle and an increasing degree of leadership of our Party in the struggles of the masses. This follows from a correct analysis of the diminishing reserve powers of American capitalism and the growing leftward drift of the masses.

The E.C.C.I. letter to our Party of April 13, 1928, states in the following way this perspective of struggle in America:

> "Amid an atmosphere of growing deep depression developing towards a crisis and more acute and aggressive policy on the part of American imperialism at home and abroad (naval budget, persecution of the workers through injunctions, Nicaragua, Philippines, Mexico and so on); and under conditions of a rapidly growing participation of the workers in mass struggles, as shown by the heroic struggle of the miners in Pennsylvania and Ohio, by the Passaic textile workers strike, the fight in the needle trades, the historic Sacco-Vanzetti agitation; the Workers' (Communist) Party, which has already played the leading role in these struggles, and was able also to take a prominent part in the miners' struggle in Colorado, has now as its major task to mobilize and organize the workers under its banner against the capitalist offensive and against the reformist supporters of capitalism, namely, the American Federation of Labor, and the Socialist Party of America." (TO BE CONTINUED)

The following document was submitted by the delegation of the Opposition in the American Party to the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, in July 1928 and signed by James P. Cannon, William Z. Foster, William F. Dunne, Alex Bittelman, J. W. Johnstone, Manuel Gomez and George Siskin. This serious and powerful political indictment of the line and activities of the Lovestone-Pepper leadership of the American Party was dismissed— after the sessions of the Congress had been concluded—with a ten line set of motions which were adopted by the Political Secretariat of the E.C.C.I. Neither the scant treatment accorded to this document by the E.C.C.I. nor the present attempt of some of the former "leaders" of the Opposition in the American Party to depart from this platform in any way disturbs the essential validity of this indictment and its proposals. Events in the Party since its presentation to the E.C.C.I. have entirely confirmed the correctness of the line of the document, and excepting certain wrong formulations contained in it on the world position and role of American imperialism, we contiue to stand on it.

The Lovestone-Pepper majority has voted to prohibit the publication or circularization of this document in the ranks. We will print it consecutively in "The Militant." The following is the first installment.—EDITORS.

OUR NEXT ISSUE

The next issue of The Militant will contain: Another installment of Trotsky's Criticism of the Draft Program of the Communist International. A review of the Presidential election results. Another section of the "Right Danger in the American Party." An article on trade union questions. Reports and comment on the struggle against bureaucratic expulsions of Communists from the Party. More documents of the Russian Opposition; and other material and comment for the Party discussion.

CIRCULATE

THE MILITANT

The Militant, official Organ of the Opposition Group in the Communist Party of America, which makes its appearance with this issue, will be published twice a month. It will print regularly the suppressed writings of Trotsky, Radek, Zinoviev and other leaders of the International Communist movement as well as timely articles and editorials on the American situation which are denied publication in the official Party Press. The material published in The Militant cannot be secured from any other source.

Subscribe to The Militant and order a bundle.

SUBSCRIPTION BLANK

Enclosed find One Dollar for one year's subscription to The Militant.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY .....

The Fortress of the World Revolution

ELEVEN years have gone by since the Russian workers took the hammer of revolution in their hands and broke the chain of World Imperialism at its weakest link. The history of the whole intervening period represents on the one hand the efforts of the imperialists to forge that chain together again and bind it tighter around the enslaved masses and, on the other hand, the struggle of the proletariat to tear it apart from the whole of humanity.

The Russian Revolution was not merely a national event—it was the beginning of and signal for the International Proletarian Revolution. Herein lies its true meaning, its great historic significance. From this standpoint the revolutionary workers of the world hail the cause of Soviet Russia as their cause on the eleventh anniversary of her "October."

The Russian Revolution broke forever the "unity" of the world and divided it into two hostile camps—the camp of imperialist exploitation and the camp of social revolution. At one polar extreme stands America, the strongest imperialist world power. At the other stands the U.S.S.R., the land of the workers rule. The antagonism between them and the systems they represent is irreconcilable. They cannot live together permanently side by side. The victory of the Soviet system on a world scale means the liberation of enslaved humanity and its ascent to heights of culture and achievement beyond our dreams—to socialism and beyond that to communism. The victory of imperialism would hurl civilization into the abyss. Such is the issue of "the epoch of wars and revolutions" in which we live and fight.

The Russian Revolution revivified the revolutionary movement of the world and inspired the proletarian masses with new confidence and hope. It lifted up the banner of socialism, trampled in the mud of social-patriotism by the traitor leaders of the "socialist" parties, and made it again synonymous with Internationalism. Lenin, the leader of the Russian Revolution, was also the leader of the Communist International which arose out of the ruins brought about by social treason in the war. Eleven years of the dictatorship of the proletariat has confirmed everything that Lenin taught about the international significance of the revolution and the indissoluble bonds between it and the world proletariat.

Soviet Russia is the fortress of the World Revolution. While it stands the imperialist system shakes on its foundations. Every attempt at "stabilization" brings greater insecurity and deeper contradictions. The example and the brotherly help of Soviet Russia inspires and strengthens the movement of the workers and oppressed peoples throughout the world. The flag of our Socialist Fatherland is the flag of our hope and on this eleventh anniversary we again hail it as our own.

Between the Soviet Republics united in the U.S.S.R. and the international revolutionary proletariat there is an organic connection. They are bound together spiritually and politically. They are united by ties of mutual solidarity which no power on earth can break. Just as the Soviet Republics constitute an impregnable fortress of the world revolution so is the international proletariat the protector of the Soviet Republics. The revolutionary workers see in every blow aimed at Soviet Russia a blow aimed at their own cause and react against it as such. Te defense of the Soviet Union is our own fight. It is and will be a central rallying slogan of the labor militants of the entire world. "Defend the Soviet Union!" is a slogan leading the workers to follow the example of the Russian Revolution. So they must conceive it. So will the victory of socialism in Russia and throughout the world be finally secured.

The victory of the Russian proletariat grew out of the World War. The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in Russia and the organization of the Communist International—two vast achievements historically linked together—are the plus signs against the slaughter of the millions and the collapse of the Second International. The imperialist war makers and their "socialist" lackeys unleashed forces which they could not conrol.

The imperialist masters of the world want to take back these gains of the workers wrested out of the bloody pit of war and revolution. Armaments are being multiplied on an unprecedented scale. War clouds darken the skies. War plans grow apace. They are aimed primarily at Soviet Russia and through it at the entire international labor movement.

The celebrations of the workers throughout the world on this eleventh anniversary of the Russian Revolution must therefore be dominated above all by the solemn realization of the war danger and the steel resolve to meet it by revolutionary means; by the resolve to put all our weight and all our sacrifice in the scale for the cause of Soviet Russia which is the cause of the oppressed and exploited

Slogans for Today

A Moscow wireless to the Daily Worker (11-1-1928) reports that the leading article of the Pravda of October 31, has raised the following slogans as "most apt to the present" for the eleventh anniversary of the Bolshevik revolution: Against the Kulak! Against the Nepman! Against the Bureaucrats!

Less than a year ago, at the 15th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the leaders of the Opposition raised precisely these slogans to be adopted by the Party. For this service Trotsky, Radek, and dozens of the best and most loyal Bolshevik fighters were expelled from the Party, and many of them sent into exile and worse.

The adoption of these slogans **now**, after a harmful delay of two or three years, is a typical example of the zig-zag policy that has characterized the course of the Central Committee in general, and the Stalin group within it in particular. And even their adoption at this point cannot, in the face of what has happened in the past, be taken at full face value.

At the 14th Party Conference the decision on the leasing of land and the employment of wage workers in the village was a concealed concession to the Kulaks. The consequence of this false measure—the extension of the franchise to exploiting elements in the village—was only a logical step in the direction of the course which yielded to the pressure of the private-capitalist elements in town and village. Armed with Stalin's slogan at the 14th Conference of the Party of "Fire against the Left"—which he later attempted to deny having issued—the Opposition was made the object of the Party's blows while the Kulak's and the Nepman's strength waxed under the false policy of the Central Committee.

The demands of the Opposition for a struggle against the Kulak so as to weaken his power and influence and prevent his growth at the expense of the poor and middle peasantry were violently rejected. As late as 1926, Stalin denounced them as raisers of "alarm," of "panic." At the 15th Party Conference (November 1926) Bucharin asked triumphantly: "Since the Kulak has become so formidable, why has he not played us some nasty trick?" A new, anti-Leninist and revisionist conception of the Kulak began to appear in the ranks of the Party. "The Kulak is growing into socialism," announced Bucharin. "The Kulak is a bogey from the old world... only represented by a few individuals already in the process of extinction," wrote Boguschevsky. "Our policy with regard to the village must advance along the line of removing and restroying the many restrictions hindering the growth and undertakings of the well-to-do peasants and Kulaks," said Bucharin at the 14th Party Conference, "we must say to the peasants, to all the peasants: Enrich yourselves, develop your undertakings, have no fear that you will be repressed." As late as one year ago, the five year plan of national economy proposed by Rykov and Kchichanovsky hailed the "decline in the private capitalist elements in town and country."

The repeated warnings of the Opposition not only went unheeded, but were denounced as "defeatism, pessimism, hopeful speculation on a crisis" and in similar slanderous manner. "The Opposition proposes to deprive the peasants of their last penny." The Opposition was endeavoring to induce us "to bleed the peasantry to the utmost, to squeeze everything possible out of him." The Stalin-Rykov-Kuibyschev economy proclamation said that they were "proposing to plunder the peasantry." The Pravda sneered at the Opposition for "its super-industrialization, its noise about Kulak and NEP dangers."

But events have their logic, and class forces and relations their irresistible pressure. The grain requisitions of this year demonstrated to the hilt the correctness of the Opposition's estimate of the growing strength and aggressiveness of the Kulak. The conspiracy in the Donetz Basin tore aside the veil that concealed the bureaucratic corruption that had seeped into the State, the economic and the Party apparatus.

The slogans adopted on the 11th anniversary, under the pressure of the Party masses and the persistent fight of the Opposition, will acquire content, point and driving power when the entire line of the Opposition will be adopted along with them. They will receive their guarantee of realization with the return to the Party of their original protagonists and most stubborn and consistent supporters with whose fight they have always been associated. Unless Stalin—who has zig-zagged from "Fire against the Left!" to "Fire against the Right!"—capitulates to the Rykov-Tomsky-Kalinin right wing in the Polburo he will be forced to the left, to the line of the Opposition. The latter alternative is the logical outcome of the tendencies and situation in the Soviet Union and its Communist Party.—m.s.

SUBSCRIBE!

To insure getting your copy of The Militant regularly you should immediately send in your subscription. Rates are One Dollar per year. Bundle orders can be had at 3 cents per copy in bundles of ten or more. Send all communications to Box 120, Madison Square Station, New York, N. Y.

The 'Outlook' Expose

The revelations contained in the current number of **The Outlook** on the innocence of the martyred Vanzetti in the Bridgewater hold-up and the scoundrelly cynicism of the authorities to whom the facts were vailable can only serve as corroborative evidence. The certainty of the entire innocence of Sacco and Vanzetti of any of the crimes charged against them was long ago firmly established in the eyes of the militant working class. **The Outlook,** a rabid supporter of the very system that murdered the two Italian rebels, is concerned only with covering the hideous, festering sores on the body of capitalist "justice," to tie the working class to the chariot of confidence in the corrupt institutions of the masters. The duty of every class-conscious worker, on the other hand, is ceaselessly to point out that the legal assassination of Sacco and Vanzetti was entirely in harmony with the processes of "justice" as it is regularly dispensed to workers by the courts of their class foe.

There is no doubt that there will be more evidence forthcoming in the future that will strike further blows at the toppling edifice of lies under which the martyrs were buried. Unfortunately, nothing can bring the two fighters back to the ranks of the working class. Their memory must serve not only as a permanent indictment against capitalism and an inspiring example of rebels' conduct, but as a mute appeal to every worker to take up and continue the fight for the defense of all class war prisoners. The case of Tom Mooney and Warren K. Billings, buried alive in California's prisons for more than twelve years, is in point. The over abundant proofs of their innocence, and the frame-up that almost sent them to the gallows have been made public long ago. It is the duty of every worker to aid with all vigor in the fight for their belated release.

The campaign of International Labor Defense for Mooney and Billings follows the right line in proceeding from the standpoint of the class struggle. The essence of the task is to make the case of Mooney and Billings again a burning issue of the labor movement. A militant fight, led and organized by the class-conscious elements, is the best assurance for a speedy victory in this fight. A prerequisite for this is a recognition of the great importance and potentialities of this issue. The opinion that the mass interest in this historic case cannot be revived is profoundly false. It is a question only of correct tactics and organization methods and energetic work. The hope of Mooney and Billings, of the Centralia I.W.W. and of every other labor prisoner in the country lies in the protest movement of the masses.